

# TRANSPORTATION ACCOUNTABILITY

---

## C O M M I S S I O N

### **Outcome Measures Subcommittee Meeting Virginia State Capitol, House Room #1 May 16, 2007**

#### **Members Present:**

Young Ho Chang, ATCS, PLC  
James Squires, Norfolk Southern Corporation  
Georjeane Blumling, AAA Tidewater Virginia  
Henry Connors Jr., CIT, Spotsylvania County Board of Supervisors  
Mortimer Downey III, PB Consult, Inc.  
Douglas Fahl, Dewberry & Davis, LLC  
Gary Fenchuk, East West Partners of Virginia, Inc.  
John Lewis, GRTC  
Mark Merhige, Shockoe Properties, Inc.  
Dr. Rosemary Pelletier, Public Private Solutions, Inc.  
Sally Thomas, Albemarle County Board of Supervisors

#### **Panelists:**

Larry Marcus, ATCS, PLC  
Robert Griffiths, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments  
John Miller, Virginia Transportation Research Council  
Trip Pollard, Southern Environmental Law Center

#### **Others Present:**

Ralph Davis, Office of the Secretary of Transportation  
Mary Lynn Tischer, Commonwealth's Multimodal Transportation Planning Office  
Julia Connally, Commonwealth Transportation Board  
Kimberly Spence, VDOT, Transportation and Mobility Planning Division  
Katherine Graham, Commonwealth's Multimodal Transportation Planning Office  
Keith Wandtke, VDOT Policy Division  
Mike Garrett, VDOT Policy Division

David Ekern, VDOT Commissioner  
Randy Burdette, DOAV Director  
Elizabeth Kersay, City of Hampton  
Marsha Fiol, VDOT - TMPD  
Rick Walton, VDOT – Commissioner's Staff  
Robin Grier, VDOT - TMPD  
Cooper Walmsley, VDOT – Environmental Division  
Linda McMinimy, Virginia Transit Association  
Mike Edwards, VACO  
Amy Hewett, Virginia Chamber of Commerce  
Ted McCormack, VACO  
Stephen Smiley

### **Meeting Summary:**

Mr. Young Ho Chang began the meeting by welcoming everyone and asking Subcommittee members and other attendees to introduce themselves. He recognized Mr. Randy Burdette, Director of the Department of Aviation. The Subcommittee then approved the April meeting minutes. He then asked if any member of the public wished to provide comments to the Subcommittee. No one came forward. The Subcommittee then approved the minutes from the April 23<sup>rd</sup> Outcome Measures Subcommittee meeting.

Mr. Chang then revised the agenda and stated that the Subcommittee would discuss performance measures for the coordination of land use and transportation. He said that following the panel discussion of land use performance measures, the goal of the meeting would be for the Subcommittee to come up with goals and performance measures to present to the full Commission in July.

Mr. Chang introduced Mr. Larry Marcus as the panel moderator. Mr. Marcus began his presentation by discussing key factors in understanding land use and transportation. He first discussed the concepts of mobility and accessibility. Mr. Marcus defined mobility as the ability to move between point A and point B. He defined accessibility as the number of opportunities or activity sites available within a certain distance or travel time. He also said that it was not reasonable to come up with a “one-size fits all” set of performance measures for urban and rural areas.

Mr. Marcus said that comprehensive planning and zoning needs to be done in conjunction with transportation planning. He said that the local environment and comprehensive plan are critical to understanding which performance measures are needed. Mr. Marcus said that urban design features such as building placement also must be considered in the development of performance

measures. He cited Tysons Corner as an example of a place which has density, but not urban design.

Mr. Marcus then introduced Mr. Robert Griffiths, who discussed evaluating growth and transportation options in the metropolitan Washington region. Mr. Griffiths said that it took a number of years to build land use into the discussion of planning for the Washington area. He pointed out that transportation dollars are mostly needed for maintenance. He indicated that the highway system will not keep pace with growth in the Washington area. According to Mr. Griffiths, the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) concluded that most of the Capital Beltway (Interstate 495) will be stop-and-go traffic in the evening by 2030. He also said that metro platforms and trains will be packed to capacity by that time. TPB asked staff to design a study to identify key issues related to land use and transportation. He said that the first issue was that job growth is outpacing household growth. He added that in the Washington region, workers are living farther away from their jobs. He said that long commute trips put the biggest strains on the transportation system. Another issue identified by the study was referred to as the "East-West Divide", where west bound travel clogs the roads during the morning rush hour. Most of the growth is located outside transit station areas. TPB developed five different scenarios of job and housing growth.

Mr. Griffiths explained that one of the possible scenarios, the "jobs out" scenario, entailed moving jobs further out to areas where people are choosing to live. Mr. Griffiths said that there will be more congestion around activity centers under the "more households" scenario and that congestion would be reduced in the suburban areas. He also said that the "more households" scenario would result in significantly greater transit use. Mr. Griffiths pointed out that the "more households" scenario would increase walking, biking, and transit use and reduce driving and congestion. He concluded that the key finding from the study was that increasing household growth and concentrating that growth in regional activity centers would increase transit use, walking, and biking, and decrease driving and congestion. He said that as a result, more household growth is now planned for regional activity centers.

Mr. Griffiths then identified the performance measures that were used for the TPB study: jobs/housing and jobs/worker ratios, % of future jobs and household growth in regional activity centers, jobs and households within  $\frac{1}{4}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile of a transit station, spatial pattern of job and household growth, and land area used to accommodate 90% of the region's jobs and housing. Mr. Griffiths said that based on the study, a 1.6 ratio was the proper jobs to housing ratio for the area to bring the jobs and housing levels into balance. He said that if the ratio is greater than 1.6, then it means that the Washington area is importing workers from other areas. He said that some areas have many more jobs than households, for example, Arlington County has a jobs-to-housing ratio of 2.0. Prince William has a ratio of 0.9 (meaning that Prince William County is exporting workers), and Fairfax County has a ratio of 1.6. Other measures he mentioned

were commuting travel modal shares, per capita vehicle miles traveled, highway and transit congestion levels, accessibility by travel mode, air quality (i.e., mobile emissions), and water quality.

Mr. John Miller presented on national best practices for coordination of transportation land use performance measures. Mr. Miller said that the Virginia Transportation Research Council (VTRC) contacted 11 states and 3 MPOs. Most states said that they do not measure transportation/land use coordination but that they may collect related performance measures depending on the reason for such coordination. Mr. Miller described the diversity of goals for transportation and land use coordination. These might be to improve transportation options, protect or manage corridors, align state and local efforts, and/or reduce land consumption. He provided a few performance measures used by other states: Commute Trips by Auto (Washington) and Per-Capita Vehicle Miles Traveled versus Density.

Mr. Miller provided a graph of VMT per capita and population density for several counties that suggested these two factors were unrelated. As noted, this was due to the definition. Mr. Miller's graph showed that Loudoun County has significantly less density than Arlington, but that the per capita vehicle miles traveled are relatively similar between the two areas. Dr. Rosemary Pelletier pointed out that Mr. Griffiths' presentation appeared to contradict Mr. Miller's presentation. She said that whereas Mr. Griffiths pointed out that increased density reduces vehicle miles traveled, Mr. Miller's data showed that increased density does not necessarily have any affect on vehicle miles traveled. Mr. Griffiths responded by saying that they each used different definitions of VMT. In Mr. Miller's graph, VMT was the amount measured in the county, whereas Mr. Griffiths was referring to household personal travel. The data indicate that in dense areas, individuals travel less. He said that in the TPB study, staff asked households how far they traveled and the trip making characteristics of each household.

Mr. Griffiths also pointed out that it is not so much density, but transit accessibility that leads to less vehicle miles traveled in Alexandria and Arlington, for example. Mr. Trip Pollard pointed out that how one looks at vehicle miles traveled can influence the conclusions that are made. Mr. Miller indicated that higher travel is correlated with increased wealth and that per capita vehicle miles traveled could decline as a result of congestion. Mr. Miller pointed out that his VMT measure was based on county level VMT divided by county level population to generate a VMT per capita. He indicated that the measure assigns VMT that does not begin or end in a jurisdiction to residents of that jurisdiction. Mr. Griffiths pointed out that his measure of VMT was based on a household survey where people were asked about their individual trip making activity to calculate VMT per capita.

Mr. Miller presented Oregon's proposed "Auto Dependence Index" (Average cost of non-auto travel divided by average cost of auto travel, where "Cost" includes

waiting time, out of pocket costs, and other “costs” to the operator). He also identified the University of Minnesota’s measure “Quality of Travel Choices” which was measured by number of accessible activity centers and jobs.

Mr. Miller pointed out that another rationale for the coordination of land use and transportation is to “Protect and Manage Corridors.” Performance measure for this might be: Percent of local governments whose land use plans agree with state corridor plans. Another goal Mr. Miller identified was: Satisfaction of coordinated customers (Missouri).

The last explanation for the coordination of land use and transportation was to “Reduce Land Consumption.” Mr. Miller identified the following performance measures for reducing land use consumption: Population and employment in the Urban Centers and Conversion of Undeveloped Land (how many acres are being developed – Twin Cities Metropolitan Council, Minnesota). Mr. Miller said some performance measures are specific to regions or localities. According to Mr. Miller states may not explicitly measure transportation and land use coordination. Mr. Miller also observed that performance measures may be driven by results (e.g., jobs within 15 minutes) and actions (e.g., miles within protected corridors).

Mr. Pollard provided a Virginia perspective on land use transportation performance measures. Mr. Pollard said that it is important to understand the context for land use and transportation. Specifically, he said that land use and transportation are top recent political issues in Virginia. He gave a number of reasons for these concerns. First, he identified loss of open space i.e., open land that has been developed. Second, he said that another reason is increased driving and congestion. He also said that Virginia has experienced growing fiscal constraints and higher construction costs. Increased interest in environmental and health impacts of transportation and concerns with energy supply are other factors that promote increased interest in land use and transportation. Mr. Pollard said that given this context and the growing awareness of the link between transportation and land use, it is important to understand that the relationship between the two is complex. He said that transportation policies and investments shape the pace, scale, and location of development. Also, he mentioned that land use policies, practices, and patterns influence the mode and distance of travel. Mr. Pollard said that in the past, land use decisions have largely ignored transportation, expecting transportation to follow development. He also said that at the state level, transportation decisions have often ignored land use impacts. Mr. Pollard pointed out that the Governor has recognized this disconnect and that there has been a significant amount of legislation designed to address the relationship between transportation and land use. He pointed out that Virginia has a very different political environment and policy structure from states such as Oregon and Florida but said that the issues such states face regarding land use and transportation coordination are increasingly similar.

Mr. Pollard then said that state, regional, and local coordination is essential for successful land use and transportation coordination. He cited other critical results of successful land use and transportation coordination: more compact developments in concert with transportation improvements, reduction in the loss of open space and environmental impacts, access management, greater transportation options, reduced congestion, and stronger communities. Mr. Pollard defined the relationship between land use and transportation as the transportation impact on the pace, location, and scale of development, and the land development impact on the mode and distance of travel. Mr. Pollard identified the following performance measures for land use and transportation: job/housing balance, perhaps also based on housing affordability; % workers within 15 to 30 minutes of their job; number and % of jobs/dwelling units/population within  $\frac{1}{4}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile of transit; % growth in areas with good accessibility; number of destinations within 15/30 minutes travel time; amount of land developed per capita; amount of farmland, forests, wetlands developed; overall density and density of approved development; vehicle miles traveled and vehicle miles traveled per capita; vehicle trips and vehicle trips per capita; modal shares for all trips; emissions and emissions per capita; % of new roads with sidewalk and bike lane/path; number of street connections per 100 acres; and gallons of gas and diesel consumed. Mr. Pollard said that data are not available – and may not be useful – at the state level for all of these performance measures. Some measures can be both state and regional/local; he also suggested that some measures could apply to specific corridors. The same basic measures should be used in most cases regardless of location, but additional nuances may exist depending on the locality and the data. Mr. Pollard said that changing the target over time is critical. He said that the appropriate target differs by measure and location and that it is important to recognize the imprecision of measures. Mr. Pollard said that jobs/housing is a useful measure, but that it is more of a regional measure than a statewide measure. He said that the job/housing ratio needs to be measured for different prices of housing and for different wage levels. He said that the measure gives a sense of people's ability to live close to work and have shorter commutes. Mr. Pollard pointed out that most trips are not commuting trips, but since they are the longest, it does address the majority of VMT.

VMT per capita is a useful measure but it has limits. It is an indicator of whether commute lengths are increasing and whether retail and other services are widely dispersed. VMT per capita is correlated with congestion growth in larger metropolitan regions and is an indicator of emissions.

Mr. Pollard concluded that there is no single best practice for performance measures for the coordination of land use and transportation. He emphasized the need to phase in the measures and said that better data and resources are needed. Mr. Pollard said that the influence of performance measures on the budget is a political decision.

At the conclusion of the panel presentations, Mr. Chang said that the Subcommittee would next engage the panel members in a discussion of performance measures for the coordination of land use and transportation and then recommend specific performance measures. He asked Mr. Marcus to be the moderator for the panel. Mr. Chang pointed out that the panel members presented a lot of very good information and agreed that there appeared to be no specific best practice for the coordination of transportation and land use. He added that as a result, Virginia may be at the forefront in terms of pushing this issue of the coordination between land use and transportation. He said that the objective was to get a full understanding of the goal and specific performance measures for land use and transportation coordination.

Mr. Chang said that he was not sure whether job/housing balance was a good performance measure and asked Mr. Marcus to discuss the pros and cons of using it as a measure. Mr. Marcus said that Montgomery County, MD has used job/housing ratio as a measure for many years and that they have been nationally recognized for transportation and land use performance measures. But he added that the definition of the measure is critical. He said that it is important to pay attention to housing costs because increased housing costs can drive people further away from an area. Mr. Griffiths said that in Northern Virginia, they use job/housing ratio not as a performance measure but rather as a forecaster of growth in jobs or housing. Mr. Pollard said that coming up with a job/housing ratio is not useful on a statewide basis. He said that it is better used for planning at the local and regional level. Mr. Miller said that there is nothing inherently wrong with tracking job/housing ratio, but because of future instability of jobs and housing, the literature indicates that establishing targets for job/housing ratio is not a good way to reduce “sprawl.”

Mr. Pollard said that no single state measure is going to be very useful. Ms. Thomas suggested that large employers be surveyed and asked for their employee zip codes to determine commute times and costs for their employees. This information could be tracked over time. However, Ms. Thomas said that she was not quite sure how to develop a specific performance measure for doing so. Mr. Griffiths said that periodic household travel surveys are typically done once a decade, but that it is harder to do this in larger communities. Mr. Pollard said that one issue is the frequency of data collection for the measures. He added that many of the measures will be expensive to collect on an annual basis.

Mr. Fahl said that some trips within jurisdictions may take a lot longer than trips across jurisdictions. He said that it is therefore more critical to do things in the planning process to make sure that jobs and housing are closer together. Mr. Fahl said that localities by law are to develop a transportation plan that is sufficient to support the local land use plan. He said that the real issue is regional planning, who is engaged in it, and whether there is a network of roads that is adequate to meet the needs of all of the regions in the area – not just roads within a locality’s own jurisdiction. Mr. Fahl said that the three key issues

to consider are: (1) protection of right of way; (2) consistency between land use and transportation plans of the localities; and (3) access management on major roadways.

Mr. Gary Fenchuk asked why Virginia continues to bring in more employers that attract more workers to an area already experiencing excessive demand on transportation facilities and other infrastructure. Housing prices increase as a result and push people further away from their jobs to find affordable housing. Mr. Griffiths said that Northern Virginia localities try to attract global firms to locate in the area and continue economic prosperity. He added that the close proximity to Washington D.C. is attractive to these firms regardless. Mr. Griffiths said that it is very hard to look at economic development as a spigot that you can turn on and off at will. He said that economic development is going to continue in Northern Virginia. However, he added that the problem is that Northern Virginia is not providing sufficient housing for people who work in the area.

Mr. Connors asked whether the Subcommittee should indicate which performance measures should be collected at the regional level versus the state level. He also pointed out that HB 3202 has job/housing listed as a measurement that is required. Mr. Chang suggested that it is within the Subcommittee's purview to consider job/housing ratio as an indicator rather than a measure and that the Subcommittee should consider the HB 3202 measures and indicate how they should be used.

Mr. Miller said that it is possible to establish modally blind measures. He also said that it is important to establish the goal prior to developing performance measures. Mr. Pollard concurred that establishing goals first will help the Subcommittee to determine which performance measures worked best. Mr. Griffiths said that the Subcommittee has to align its performance measures with its goals. Mr. Marcus also said that there needs to be a linkage between the measures and goals.

Mr. Chang reiterated the Commission's goal to establish measures for effective coordination of land use and transportation. He said that one of the Subcommittee's struggles is how to define "effective coordination."

Mr. Lewis asked about the connection between mobility and accessibility. He asked whether there was a way to come up with performance measures that relate to both mobility and accessibility and also account for job/housing balance. Mr. Griffiths said it is important to measure accessibility by travel mode. He said that all other things being equal, by concentrating housing and employment growth into activity centers, accessibility will increase. Mr. Marcus said that it may be possible to create such a performance measure as Mr. Lewis envisions, but questioned whether it could be mandated by the state. Mr. Miller said that the local employment dynamics section of the Census Bureau's website will show you where people are living and working and the different modal



opportunities for those people. However, he said that he did not know whether salary information was available.

Mr. Chang said that it is critical to define what is meant by “effective” coordination of land use and transportation. Mr. Fenchuk said that he is concerned that simplistically setting goals could result in rather draconian strategy options for addressing those goals. He said that even with some of the performance measures such as job/housing ratio, the connection to coordination of land use and transportation is a bit suspect because commuting is only a fraction of the total trips. Mr. Fenchuk also said that it would be a mistake, for example, to require that all jurisdictions have bike and pedestrian trails when such trails might not work in all situations. He gave an example of a bike trail that he viewed as particularly dangerous in one specific jurisdiction.

Mr. Chang asked whether the panel could provide a succinct definition of effective land use and transportation coordination. Mr. Miller selected two: having multiple transportation options and well-managed corridors. Regarding compatibility of plans, Mr. Miller indicated that there may be a difference in what a region wants versus what the state wants for a particular corridor. Mr. Miller agreed with Mr. Chang when he suggested that Mr. Miller was really referring to “access management.” Mr. Pollard said that a measure of density of housing units would suffice to measure sprawl. Mr. Fenchuk asked Mr. Pollard what the prototype community development would be. Mr. Pollard said that there is no real prototype. Mr. Griffiths said that the coordination of land use and transportation means the consistency of land use and transportation plans. Mr. Griffiths commented that there is a lot of good planning going on in the Dulles Corridor.

Mr. Fahl said that in the grand scheme of things, Metro made sense in the Washington region. He added that as a result however, the area around Metro is more congested. He said a lot depends on one’s perspective on coordination of land use and transportation. He said that one can look at it from a broader perspective as developers and transportation planners do, or one can look at the issue from the resident’s perspective. He said that effective coordination of land use and transportation is to have a land use plan that does not overwhelm the transportation plan. Mr. Fahl suggested that was the definition of effective land use coordination with transportation.

Mr. Chang proposed that the Subcommittee finalize its goal for transportation and land use, develop associated performance measures for that goal, and then finalize all other goals and performance measures. Dr. Tischer then presented a table from Mr. Miller’s presentation specifically identifying potential land use performance measures for the Subcommittee to consider. Dr. Tischer then identified the performance measures that Mr. Pollard raised in his presentation.

Mr. Randy Burdette suggested that the Subcommittee differentiate between statewide goals and regional accountability. Mr. Chang asked whether the Subcommittee agreed that they need to differentiate between measures at the state level and at the regional level. The Subcommittee members agreed.

Mr. Chang suggested that the Subcommittee possibly set up sub-goals such as corridor management, protecting open space, how local plan is aligned with state effort. Deputy Secretary Davis asked the Subcommittee to identify core objectives under the broad goal of transportation and land use and then performance measures under the objectives.

Mr. Fahl asked whether the Subcommittee has established a consensus about what it means to have coordination between land use and coordination. The Subcommittee members indicated that such a definition has not yet been established. Ms. Thomas said that the lack of coordination of land use and transportation can affect safety. She said that in the Route 29 corridor, they are developing a coordinated transportation and land use plan, which appears to be the way that local governments and VDOT want such coordination to occur. Ms. Thomas said that local governments do know how to coordinate land use and transportation but do not always do it. She added that VDOT should recognize that localities do not always coordinate land use and transportation and should provide funds to coordinate the two. Ms. Thomas suggested that what gets measured gets focused on.

Mr. Fahl said that the law states that the transportation plan should support the land use plan. Mr. Chang said that each jurisdiction is developing its own land use plan. He asked how much coordination there is among localities and among the transportation agencies to come up with the plan. Mr. Fahl said that the local land use plans, which guide local decision-making, are developed without taking into consideration whether the transportation system can handle the growth. Mr. Lewis said that the problem is that currently, the transportation system is supposed to support the land use. Mr. Lewis said that he believes it should be the other way around: land use should support the transportation system. Ms. Thomas said the type of land use supports the type of transportation you will need. She said that it is not a two way balance. Mr. Fahl disagreed. Deputy Secretary Davis said that transportation options and well managed corridors are both possible objectives under the land use goal. Mr. Lewis said that the Subcommittee is not there yet. Dr. Pelletier pointed out that the Subcommittee still cannot agree on the definition of coordination of land use and transportation. She said that before the Subcommittee proceeds, they need to agree on a goal for land use and transportation. Mr. Merhige asked whether coordination can be accomplished without reducing quality of life concerns such as Ms. Thomas has. Mr. Lewis added that there are many different definitions of "coordinating". He said that the Subcommittee ought to be directing some specific outcome that they are looking for; for example either restricting land use or increasing transportation.

Mr. Chang asked what would be gained if land use was restricted. Mr. Fahl responded that restricting land use reduces the rate of growth of congestion. Mr. Fahl said that this Commission would not exist if it were not for congestion in Northern Virginia. Deputy Secretary Davis asked whether congestion is the measure of land use in transportation. Mr. Chang additionally asked what the outcome would be from better land use coordination. Mr. Fahl said that congestion reduction would be the overarching goal that coordination of land use and transportation would achieve, however that other things like more transit would occur as a result of the coordination. Dr. Pelletier suggested that enhancing quality of life would be an outcome of coordinating land use by developing livable communities. Mr. Downey said that congestion can be mitigated with accessibility, but it requires land use coordination, and the goal is livability. Mr. Connors said that preserving the landscape is also worth consideration since it was one of the Governor's stated goals: "getting the most from our transportation investments, reducing congestion, protecting our neighborhoods and communities, protecting landscapes."

Mr. Chang said that the Subcommittee should consider that the goal of land use is to promote livable communities. He said that the goal has a number of objectives. The first objective would be to reduce congestion by improving transportation options. Mr. Chang said that the goal would be further defined by performance measures. Deputy Secretary Davis suggested that there are land use issues in areas of the state where there is less congestion. Mr. Chang said that "improved transportation options" is a good objective, as well as protecting transportation corridors.

Mr. Fahl emphasized that protecting corridors should not be confused with managing corridors. He said that protecting a corridor is more of an access issue. Protecting the right-of-way is a critical issue – not just for roads. Mr. Chang said that corridor protection should not only focus on environmental protection, but also future transportation corridors protection (i.e., right-of-way). Mr. Fahl suggested that the state could use its influence more on this issue but has not done so.

Dr. Tischer suggested that another objective should be consistency between transportation and land use plans at the state, regional, and local level. Ms. Thomas said she was concerned that the localities would have to conform to the state plan if such an objective was adopted. Mr. Burdette suggested that the term could be "congruency" rather than "consistency." Ms. Thomas said that there have been times when state and local plans disagree and she is concerned that the localities have to always do what the state suggests.

At this time, Mr. Chang said that it was clear that the Subcommittee will need to have another meeting. He said that the Subcommittee has set aside another meeting date in June.

Mr. Connors said that incentives should be established for local governments to pay better attention to this issue. Mr. Lewis said that perhaps the incentive could be that if local governments better coordinate land use and transportation, their projects could more likely be implemented by the CTB or receive a higher priority score, for example.

Mr. Connors said that language is needed to explain the value of historic resources when considering coordination of land use and transportation. The Subcommittee agreed that reducing land consumption was another objective. Mr. Fahl said that if settlement patterns were different, Virginia would have better transportation options, less land consumption, etc. However, he added that too many other factors influence land use for it to be determined exclusively by transportation. Ms. Thomas suggested measuring dispersed settlement patterns versus density and the affect it has on congestion, air quality, etc. Ms. Thomas also suggested promoting urban centers. Mr. Fahl said that he does not agree with reduced land use as an objective and that he prefers Ms. Thomas's suggestion of promoting community development patterns. The Subcommittee agreed with the suggestion. Mr. Chang said that he envisioned a matrix of objectives and measures for the land use and transportation coordination goal to identify statewide measures, and regional/local measures.

Mr. Chang said that prior to the next meeting, a revised list of land use measures would be developed. He asked the Subcommittee members to be prepared to talk about finalizing the goals and performance measures for all of the goals. Deputy Secretary Davis said that the Subcommittee still needs to address the following issues: (1) quantifiable ways to measure the positive and negative impacts of transportation projects, (2) HB 3202 performance measures, (3) regional performance measures, and (4) the issue of project prioritization. He said that some sections of HB 3202 identify performance measures. Deputy Secretary Davis suggested that the Subcommittee list what measures they did and did not capture from HB 3202 (and if not, why not). He said that the Subcommittee should not be setting targets at the state level for job/housing ratio.

Mr. Chang then announced that the next meeting would be June 19, 2007.

The meeting was adjourned.